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Abstract

The Lüders rule provides a way to define a quantum channel given a quantum measurement. Using this construction, we establish an if-and-only-if condition for the existence of a \(d\)-dimensional Symmetric Informationally Complete quantum measurement (a SIC) in terms of a particular depolarizing channel. Moreover, the channel in question satisfies two entropic optimality criteria.

1 Introduction

A minimal informationally complete (MIC) quantum measurement for a \(d\) dimensional Hilbert space \(\mathcal{H}_d\) is a set of linearly independent positive semi-definite operators \(\{E_i\}, \ i = 1, \ldots, d^2\), which sum to the identity \([1, 2]\). If every element in a MIC is proportional to a rank-\(n\) projector, we say the MIC itself is rank-\(n\), and if the pairwise Hilbert–Schmidt inner products of distinct MIC elements are equal, we say the MIC is equiangular. A symmetric informationally complete (SIC) quantum measurement is a rank-1 equiangular MIC \([4, 5, 6, 7]\). When a SIC \(\{H_i\}\) exists, one can show that \(H_i = \frac{1}{d} \Pi_i\) where \(\Pi_i\) are rank-1 projectors and that

\[
\text{tr} \ H_i H_j = \frac{d \delta_{ij} + 1}{d^2(d + 1)} .
\]

Consider a physicist Alice who is preparing to send a quantum system through a channel that she models by a function \(E\). Alice initially describes her quantum system by assigning to it a density matrix \(\rho\). The state \(E(\rho)\) encodes Alice’s expectations for measurements that can potentially be performed after the system is sent through the channel. More specifically, let Alice’s channel be a Lüders MIC channel (LMC) associated with the MIC \(\{E_i\}\), which may be understood in the following way. Alice plans to apply the MIC \(\{E_i\}\), and upon obtaining the result of that measurement, invoke the Lüders rule \([8, 9]\) to obtain a new state for her system,

\[
\rho'_i = \frac{1}{\text{tr} E_i} \sqrt{E_i} \rho \sqrt{E_i} ,
\]

where we have introduced the principal Kraus operators \(\{\sqrt{E_i}\}\), the unique positive semi-definite square roots of the MIC elements. Before applying her MIC, Alice can write the post-channel state

\[
\mathcal{E}(\rho) := \sum_i p(E_i) \rho'_i = \sum_i \sqrt{E_i} \rho \sqrt{E_i} ,
\]

which is a weighted average of the states from which Alice plans to select the actual state she will ascribe to the system after making the measurement. (For more on the broader conceptual context of this operation, see \([10, 11]\).)

We refer to the LMC obtained from a SIC as the SIC channel \(\mathcal{E}_{\text{SIC}}\). We may characterize the SIC channel in any dimension in which a SIC exists as follows. Note that the basis dual to a SIC is \(H_j = (d + 1) \Pi_j - I\), so we may write an operator \(X \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_d)\) in the SIC basis as

\[
X = \sum_j (\text{tr} X H_j) H_j = (d + 1) \sum_j (\text{tr} X \Pi_j) H_j - (\text{tr} X) I .
\]
Noting that \((\text{tr} \Pi_j) \mathcal{H}_j = \frac{1}{d} \sum_j \Pi_j \mathcal{H}_j\) and that \(\sqrt{\mathcal{H}_j} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \Pi_j\), we obtain
\[
\mathcal{E}_{\text{SIC}}(X) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_j \Pi_j X \Pi_j = \frac{(\text{tr} X) I + X}{d+1},
\]
and so for any quantum state \(\rho\),
\[
\mathcal{E}_{\text{SIC}}(\rho) = \frac{I + \rho}{d+1}.
\]
The following theorem reveals that the SIC channel’s action is unique to SICs among LMCs.

**Theorem 1.** A SIC exists in dimension \(d\) iff there is an LMC with action \(\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \frac{I + \rho}{d+1}\) for all \(\rho\).

**Proof.** If a SIC exists, take \(\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_{\text{SIC}}\). For the other direction our first task is to demonstrate the MIC associated with \(\mathcal{E}\) must be rank-1. To do this we will establish a general lower bound applicable to an arbitrary LMC for the average maximal eigenvalue of the post-channel state \(\mathcal{E}(\rho)\), where the average is taken over all pure state inputs. For an arbitrary pure state \(\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle \psi|\),
\[
\mathcal{E}(|\psi\rangle\langle \psi|) = \sum_i \sqrt{E_i} |\psi\rangle\langle \psi| \sqrt{E_i}.
\]
We may lower bound the maximal eigenvalue of \(\mathcal{E}(|\psi\rangle\langle \psi|)\), denoted \(\lambda_{\text{max}}\), given such an input with
\[
\lambda_{\text{max}} \geq \langle \psi| \mathcal{E}(|\psi\rangle\langle \psi|) |\psi\rangle = \sum_i |\langle \psi| \sqrt{E_i} |\psi\rangle|^2.
\]
If we now average over all pure states with the Haar measure, we will produce a generic lower bound on the average maximal eigenvalue of the post-channel state. As the function we wish to average is a polynomial on \(\mathcal{H}_d\), we may make use of the theory of quantum \(t\)-designs [12]. A \(t\)-design is a set of unit vectors in \(\mathcal{H}_d\) such that the average of any polynomial function of degree \(t\) or less over the design is equal to the average of the polynomial over all pure states with the Haar measure. The functions we wish to average are second-order polynomials on \(\mathcal{H}_d\), so averaging over all pure states is equivalent to averaging over a 2-design. In fact, the pure states of a SIC, if one exists, form a minimal 2-design, but one can always find an \(N > d^2\) such that a 2-design with \(N\) vectors exists in dimension \(d\), even if we don’t have a SIC in hand [3].

Suppose \(|\psi_j\rangle\), \(j = 1, \ldots, N\), are vectors forming a 2-design in dimension \(d\) and \(P_j\) are the associated projectors. A consequence of the 2-design definition is the identity
\[
\frac{1}{N} \sum_j P_j \otimes P_j = \frac{2}{d(d+1)} P_{\text{sym}},
\]
where \(P_{\text{sym}}\) is the projector onto the symmetric subspace of \(\mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_d\). We use the notation \(f(|\psi\rangle\langle \psi|)\) to denote the average value of the function \(f(|\psi\rangle\langle \psi|)\) over all inputs \(|\psi\rangle\langle \psi|\) with respect to the Haar measure. For convenience, let \(e_i\) denote the trace of the POVM element \(E_i\). Thus we have
\[
\lambda_{\text{max}} \geq \sum_i \int_\mathcal{H} |\langle \psi| \sqrt{E_i} |\psi\rangle|^2 d\Omega_\psi
= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{ij} |\langle \psi_j| \sqrt{E_i} |\psi_j\rangle|^2
= \sum_i \text{tr} \left[ \left( \sqrt{E_i} \otimes \sqrt{E_i} \right) \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_j P_j \otimes P_j \right) \right]
= \frac{2}{d(d+1)} \sum_i \text{tr} \left[ \left( \sqrt{E_i} \otimes \sqrt{E_i} \right) P_{\text{sym}} \right]
= \frac{2}{d(d+1)} \sum_i \left( \text{tr} \sqrt{E_i} \right)^2 \geq \frac{2}{d(d+1)} \sum_i e_i = \frac{2}{d+1},
\]
We may see by inspection that the maximal eigenvalue for a pure state input for our channel is always $\frac{2}{d+1}$ and the second inequality in equation (10) is saturated if the MIC is rank-1.

Although SIC existence is not assured, one may always form a quasi-SIC in any finite dimension $d$. A quasi-SIC is a set of Hermitian operators obeying the same Hilbert–Schmidt inner product condition as the SIC projectors. As positivity is not demanded, it is relatively easy to construct a quasi-SIC as follows [13]. Start with an orthonormal basis for the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(d)$ of traceless Hermitian operators. With the Hilbert–Schmidt inner product this space is a $(d^2-1)$-dimensional Euclidean space, so it is possible to construct a regular simplex $\{B_i\}$ consisting of $d^2$ normalized traceless Hermitian operators. In this case $\text{tr} \, B_i B_j = \frac{-1}{d^2-1}$ when $i \neq j$. Then the operators

$$Q_i = \sqrt{\frac{d-1}{d}} B_i + \frac{1}{d} I$$

form a quasi-SIC.

It turns out that $A_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} Q_i$ give a set of Kraus operators such that

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \sum_j A_j \rho A_j^\dagger = \frac{I + \rho}{d + 1},$$

or, more generally, for an arbitrary operator $X$,

$$\mathcal{E}(X) = \frac{(\text{tr} \, X) I + X}{d + 1},$$

that is, equivalent to the action of $\mathcal{E}_{\text{SIC}}$. To see this, first observe from Corollary 1 in [14] that

$$\frac{1}{d} \sum_i Q_i \otimes Q_i^T = \frac{2}{d+1} P_{\text{sym}}^T = \frac{1}{d+1} \left( I \otimes I + \sum_{kl} |kk\rangle \langle ll| \right),$$

where $T_B$ indicates the partial transpose over the second subsystem. Then, with the help of the vectorized notation for an operator $|A\rangle := \sum_i A \otimes |i\rangle |i\rangle$ and the identity $|BAB\rangle = B \otimes B^T |A\rangle$, we have

$$|\mathcal{E}(X)\rangle = \frac{1}{d} \sum_i Q_i \otimes Q_i^T |X\rangle$$

$$= \frac{1}{d+1} \left( I \otimes I + \sum_{kl} |kk\rangle \langle ll| \right) \sum_m \langle X \otimes I |mm\rangle$$

$$= \frac{1}{d+1} \left( |X\rangle + \sum_{klm} |k\rangle \langle l| X |m\rangle \otimes |k\rangle \langle l| I |m\rangle \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{d+1} \left( |X\rangle + \sum_{klm} \langle m| X |m\rangle |k\rangle \langle k| \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{d+1} \left( |X\rangle + |(\text{tr} \, X) I\rangle \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{d+1} \left( |X\rangle + |(\text{tr} \, X) I\rangle \right),$$

which is equivalent to (13). Sending $X = I$ through equation (13) reveals the identity

$$\frac{1}{d} \sum_i Q_i^2 = I,$$

which, since the quasi-SICs are Hermitian, is equivalent to the requirement that Kraus operators satisfy $\sum_i A_i^\dagger A_i = I$. Any other set of Kraus operators with the same effect will be related to this set by a unitary remixing, and since $\mathcal{E}$ is an LMC, we must have

$$\sqrt{\mathcal{E}} = \sum_j [U]_{ij} A_j.$$
Since we know the MIC is rank-1, we can trace both sides of this expression to obtain the identity \( \sqrt{d e_i} = \sum_j [U]_{ij} \). Furthermore, since the \( A_j \) form a Hermitian basis, one may see that every element of \( U \) must be real. Then

\[
\text{tr} \left( \sqrt{E_i} \sqrt{E_j} \right) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k,l} [U]^*_{lk} [U]_{kl} \text{tr} Q_k Q_l = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k,l} [U]^*_{lk} [U]_{kl} \frac{d \delta_{kl} + 1}{d + 1}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{d(d+1)} \left( d \sum_k [U]^*_{kj} [U]_{jk} + \left( \sum_k [U]^*_{lk} \right) \left( \sum_l [U]_{jl} \right) \right) \quad (18)
\]

When \( i = j \), we have

\[
e_i = 1 + e_i = \frac{d}{d+1} \Rightarrow e_i = \frac{1}{d},
\]

and so

\[
\text{tr} \left( \sqrt{E_i} \sqrt{E_i} \right) = \frac{d \delta_{ij} + 1}{d(d+1)},
\]

and because \( E_i \) is rank-1,

\[
\text{tr} (E_i E_j) = \frac{d \delta_{ij} + 1}{d^2(d+1)},
\]

that is, the MIC is a SIC.

2 Depolarizing Lüders MIC Channels

The SIC channel falls within a class of channels called depolarizing channels [21]. A depolarizing channel is a channel

\[
\mathcal{E}_\alpha(\rho) = \alpha \rho + \frac{1 - \alpha}{d} I, \quad -\frac{1}{d^2-1} \leq \alpha \leq 1.
\]

The SIC channel corresponds to \( \alpha = \frac{1}{d^2-1} \). One might wish to know when an LMC is a depolarizing channel. From Theorem 1, we know the only LMC with \( \alpha = \frac{1}{d^2-1} \) is the SIC channel. What range of \( \alpha \) are achievable by LMCs?

The answer to this question is any \( \frac{1}{d^2-1} \leq \alpha < 1 \). To see this, note that the eigenvalue spectrum for a depolarizing channel given a pure state input is

\[
\lambda(\mathcal{E}_\alpha(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)) = \left( \alpha + \frac{1-\alpha}{d}, \frac{1-\alpha}{d}, \ldots, \frac{1-\alpha}{d} \right)
\]

Recall the lower bound on the average maximal eigenvalue for any LMC given a pure state input from the proof of Theorem 1 is \( \frac{2}{d+1} \). As the spectrum for a depolarizing channel is constant for pure state inputs, the lower bound on the average is the lower bound for any pure state input. If \( \lambda_{\text{max}} = \frac{1-\alpha}{d} \), then \( \frac{1-\alpha}{d} \geq \alpha + \frac{1-\alpha}{d} \Leftrightarrow \alpha \leq 0 \). The more negative \( \alpha \) is, the larger the maximal eigenvalue would be, so the largest it can get is when \( \alpha = \frac{1}{d^2-1} \), in which case \( \lambda_{\text{max}} = \frac{d}{d^2-1} < \frac{2}{d+1} \). So, \( \lambda_{\text{max}} = \alpha + \frac{1-\alpha}{d} \geq \frac{2}{d+1} \Leftrightarrow \alpha \geq \frac{1}{d^2-1} \).

When \( \alpha = 1 \), the channel is the identity channel, in other words, not depolarizing at all. It is easy to prove that were this to be implemented by an LMC, it would require \( \sqrt{E_i} = \frac{1}{d} I \), but this does not lead to a linearly independent set and is not a MIC. If a SIC exists, however, a depolarizing LMC exists for any \( \frac{1}{d^2-1} \leq \alpha < 1 \), as the next proposition shows.

Proposition 1. For a nonzero \( \beta \in \left[-\frac{1}{d^2-1}, 1\right] \) satisfying

\[
\alpha = 1 - \frac{(\sqrt{1-\beta + d \beta} - \sqrt{1-\beta})^2}{d + 1},
\]

(24)
or, equivalently,
\[ \beta = \frac{1}{d^2} \left( (d-2)(d+1)(1-\alpha) + 2\sqrt{(d+1)(1-\alpha)(1-\alpha+d^2\alpha)} \right), \]  
the MIC
\[ E_i = \frac{\beta}{d} \Pi_i + \frac{1-\beta}{d^2} I, \]  
where \( \Pi_i \) is a SIC projector, gives rise to the LMC
\[ E_\alpha(\rho) = \alpha \rho + \frac{1-\alpha}{d} I, \quad \frac{1}{d+1} \leq \alpha < 1. \]  
One may check that the principal Kraus operators associated with the MIC elements (26) are given by
\[ A_i = \sqrt{1-\beta+d\beta} - \sqrt{1-\beta} \Pi_i + \sqrt{1-\beta} d I, \]  
and then a routine calculation and the characterization of the SIC channel from Theorem 1 confirms the claim of the proposition.

Remark 1. When \( \beta = 1 \), the MIC \( \{E_i\} \) is the original SIC, whereas when \( \beta \) equals its minimum allowed value \(-1/(d-1)\), it is the rank-(\( d-1 \)) equiangular MIC
\[ E_i = \frac{1}{d(d-1)} (-\Pi_i + I), \]  
indirectly noted in prior work [2, 15, 16] for extremizing a nonclassicality measure based on negativity of quasi-probability.

Do any LMCs give rise to depolarizing channels in dimensions where one does not have access to a SIC? To answer this, replace the SIC projector in equation (28) with a quasi-SIC to form Kraus operators effecting the same depolarizing channel,
\[ K_i = \frac{\sqrt{1-\beta+d\beta}}{d} - \frac{\sqrt{1-\beta}}{d} \Pi_i + \frac{\sqrt{1-\beta}}{d} d I. \]  
From (16), one can check that these will square to a valid MIC. For arbitrary \( \beta \), however, \( K_i \) may fail to be positive semi-definite and would therefore not be a principal Kraus operator. From the definition of a quasi-SIC, one sees that the eigenvalues of \( Q_i \) are bounded below by \(-1\). Even in this worst case, one can easily derive that \( K_i \) will be positive semi-definite for any nonzero \( \beta \leq \frac{3}{d^2-1} \). This range of \( \beta \) entitles any \( \alpha \geq \frac{d^2-1}{d^2-4} \). (The minimal \( \alpha \) is obtained from the most negative \( \beta \).) When \( d = 2 \), this minimal \( \alpha \) matches the lower bound achieved by the SIC channel because every quasi-SIC is a SIC in this dimension, but for all \( d > 2 \) the inequality is strict and monotonically increases with dimension. In practice, the minimal eigenvalue among all of the quasi-SIC operators one constructs will be significantly larger than \(-1\), and so, depending on how close to a SIC one can make their quasi-SIC, one should be able to get significantly closer to the SIC bound than the \( \alpha \) we have derived.

Fully classifying the MICs giving depolarizing LMCs for particular values of \( \alpha > \frac{1}{d^2-1} \) appears to be a difficult problem; it is not clear what properties these MICs must satisfy. For example, squaring the \( K_i \) operators from equation (30) results in MICs which are dependent on one’s quasi-SIC implementation and need not be equiangular as the family in equation (26) was. All principal Kraus operators which give rise to a depolarizing channel with a given \( \beta \) (and corresponding \( \alpha \)) will be related to the operators (30) by way of a unitary remixing satisfying
\[ \sqrt{E_i} = \sum_j [U]_{ij} K_j \]  
for some unitary \( U \). As in the proof of Theorem 1, all the elements of the unitary must be real and so it is actually an orthogonal matrix. We have not been able to identify any further necessary characteristics of the \( U \) in the completely general case, but the following notable restriction yielded further structure. A
MIC is equal-weight if the traces of all the elements are equal, that is, if \( e_i = \frac{1}{d} \) for all \( i \). MICs in this class have the property that their measurement outcome probabilities for the “garbage state” \( \frac{1}{d} I \) input is the flat probability distribution over \( d^2 \) outcomes. From the standpoint of [1], this means they preserve the intuition that the state \( \frac{1}{d} I \) should correspond to a prior with complete outcome indifference in a reference process scenario and accordingly warrant special attention. If we demand that \( \{ E_i \} \) be equal-weight, then it is necessary, but not sufficient, that the orthogonal matrix remixing (30) be doubly quasistochastic (see Appendix).

3 Entropic Optimality

One way to evaluate the performance of a quantum channel is by using measures based on von Neumann entropy,

\[
S(\rho) = -\text{tr} \rho \log \rho .
\]

In this section, we consider two such, proving in each case an optimality result for LMCs constructed from SICs. To understand the conceptual significance of the bounds we will derive, consider again Alice who is preparing to send a quantum system through an LMC. Alice initially ascribes the quantum state \( \rho \) to her system, and before sending the system through the channel, she computes \( \mathcal{E}(\rho) \). After eliciting a measurement outcome, Alice will update her quantum-state assignment, not to \( \mathcal{E}(\rho) \) but rather to whichever \( \rho' \) corresponds to the outcome \( E_i \) that actually transpires. The state \( \mathcal{E}(\rho) \) will generally be mixed, while \( \rho' \) will be a pure state in the case of a rank-1 MIC. This change from mixed to pure represents a sharpening of Alice’s expectations about her quantum system. We can quantify this in entropic terms, even for MICs that are not rank-1. In fact, for pure state inputs we can calculate Alice’s typical sharpening of expectations by averaging the post-channel von Neumann entropy over the possible input states using the Haar measure, denoted \( S(\mathcal{E}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)) \). We will see that SIC channels give the largest possible typical sharpening of expectations.

In the following we make use of a partial ordering on real vectors arranged in nonincreasing order called majorization [17]. A real vector \( x \) rearranged into nonincreasing order is written as \( x^\downarrow \). Then we say a vector \( x \) majorizes a vector \( y \), denoted \( x \succ y \), if all of the leading partial sums of \( x^\downarrow \) are greater than or equal to the leading partial sums of \( y^\downarrow \) and if the sum of all the elements of each is equal. Explicitly, \( x \succ y \) if

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k} x_i^\downarrow \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} y_i^\downarrow , \quad (33)
\]

for \( k = 1 \ldots N - 1 \) and \( \sum_i x_i = \sum_i y_i \). Speaking heuristically, if \( x \succ y \), then \( y \) is a flatter vector than \( x \). A Schur convex function is a function \( f \) satisfying the implication \( x \succ y \implies f(x) \geq f(y) \). A function is strictly Schur convex if the inequality is strict when \( x^\downarrow \neq y^\downarrow \). When the inequality is reversed the function is called Schur concave.

Theorem 2. Let \( \mathcal{E} \) be an LMC. \( S(\mathcal{E}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)) \leq \log(d + 1) - \frac{2}{d+1} \log 2 \) with equality achievable if a SIC exists in dimension \( d \).

Proof. In the proof of Theorem 1, we lower bounded the average maximal eigenvalue for the output of an arbitrary LMC given a pure state input by \( \frac{2}{d+1} \). This implies

\[
\lambda(\mathcal{E}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)) \geq \left( \frac{1 - \bar{x}_{\max}}{d - 1}, \frac{1 - \bar{x}_{\max}}{d - 1}, \ldots, \frac{1 - \bar{x}_{\max}}{d - 1} \right) \geq \left(\frac{2}{d+1}, \frac{1}{d+1}, \ldots, \frac{1}{d+1} \right). \quad (34)
\]

The Shannon entropy \( H(P) = -\sum_i P_i \log P_i \) is a concave and Schur concave function of probability distributions. Furthermore, the von Neumann entropy of a density matrix is equal to the Shannon entropy of its eigenvalue spectrum. Using these facts we have

\[
S(\mathcal{E}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)) = H(\lambda(\mathcal{E}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|))) \leq H\left(\lambda(\mathcal{E}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|))\right) \leq \log(d + 1) - \frac{2}{d+1} \log 2 . \quad (35)
\]

If a SIC exists, taking \( \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_{\text{SIC}} \) achieves this upper bound. \( \square \)
Theorem 2 would have been more forceful if the upper bound were saturated “only if” a SIC exists, but we were unable to demonstrate this property, and so we leave it as a conjecture:

**Conjecture 1.** Equality is achievable in the statement of Theorem 2 only if a SIC exists in dimension $d$.

We were, however, able to prove a strong SIC optimality result in the setting of bipartite systems, applicable for example to Bell-test scenarios. The *entropy exchange* for a channel $\mathcal{E}$ upon input by state $\rho$ is defined [18] to be the von Neumann entropy of the result of sending one half of a purification of $\rho$, $|\Psi\rangle$, through the channel:

$$ S(\rho, \mathcal{E}) := S(I \otimes \mathcal{E}(|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|)) . $$

**Theorem 3.** Let $\mathcal{E}$ be an LMC. Then $S\left( \frac{1}{d} I, \mathcal{E} \right) \leq \log d + \frac{d-1}{d} \log(d+1)$ with equality achievable iff a SIC exists in dimension $d$.

**Proof.** The purification of the state $\frac{1}{d} I$ is the maximally entangled state $|ME\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_i |ii\rangle$. Let $\lambda$ be the eigenvalues of $I \otimes \mathcal{E}(|ME\rangle\langle ME|)$ arranged in nonincreasing order. We may lower bound the maximal eigenvalue as follows:

$$ \lambda_{\text{max}} \geq \langle ME| I \otimes \mathcal{E}(|ME\rangle\langle ME|)|ME\rangle = \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{ijkl} \langle ii| I \otimes \mathcal{E}(|jj\rangle\langle kk|)|ll\rangle = \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{ijkl} \langle ii| (|jj\rangle \otimes \mathcal{E}(|jj\rangle) )|ll\rangle = \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{i} \langle i| \mathcal{E}(|i\rangle\langle l|)|l\rangle = \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{ij} \langle i| \sqrt{E_j} |i\rangle |l\rangle \sqrt{E_j} |l\rangle = \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{j} \left( \text{tr} \sqrt{E_j} \right)^2 \geq \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{j} e_j = \frac{1}{d} . $$

Thus,

$$ \lambda \succ \left( \lambda_{\text{max}}, \frac{1 - \lambda_{\text{max}}}{d^2 - 1}, \ldots, \frac{1 - \lambda_{\text{max}}}{d^2 - 1} \right) \succ \left( \frac{1}{d}, \frac{1}{d(d+1)}, \ldots, \frac{1}{d(d+1)} \right) . $$

The upper bound now follows from the Schur concavity of von Neumann entropy.

If a SIC exists, it is easy to verify that

$$ I \otimes \mathcal{E}_{\text{SIC}}(|ME\rangle\langle ME|) = \frac{1}{d} I \otimes I + |ME\rangle\langle ME| $$

which saturates the upper bound. Von Neumann entropy is strictly Schur concave [19], so the upper bound is saturated iff $\lambda = \left( \frac{1}{d}, \frac{1}{d(d+1)}, \ldots, \frac{1}{d(d+1)} \right)$. Equation (37) shows that $|ME\rangle$ is the maximal eigenstate and that $\{E_j\}$ is a rank-1 MIC. By the spectral decomposition, we may write

$$ I \otimes \mathcal{E}(|ME\rangle\langle ME|) = \frac{1}{d} |ME\rangle\langle ME| + \frac{1}{d(d+1)} \sum_{i=2}^{d^2} P_i $$

where $P_i$ are projectors into the other $d^2 - 1$ eigenstates. As the full set of projectors forms a resolution of the identity, we have

$$ \sum_{i=2}^{d^2} P_i = I \otimes I - |ME\rangle\langle ME| $$

so

$$ I \otimes \mathcal{E}(|ME\rangle\langle ME|) = \frac{1}{d} |ME\rangle\langle ME| + \frac{1}{d(d+1)} (I \otimes I - |ME\rangle\langle ME|) = \frac{1}{d} I \otimes I + |ME\rangle\langle ME| $$

as desired.
It follows from (14) that
\[ |ME\rangle\langle ME| = \frac{d+1}{d^2} \sum_{i=1}^{d^2} Q^T_i \otimes Q_i - \frac{1}{d} I \otimes I, \tag{43} \]
where \( Q_i \) are quasi-SICs. From the previous expression we now have
\[ I \otimes \mathcal{E}(|ME\rangle\langle ME|) = \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_i Q^T_i \otimes Q_i. \tag{44} \]
Applying \( I \otimes \mathcal{E} \) directly to equation (43) gives us
\begin{align*}
I \otimes \mathcal{E}(|ME\rangle\langle ME|) &= \frac{d+1}{d^2} \sum_i Q^T_i \otimes \mathcal{E}(Q_i) - \frac{1}{d} I \otimes I \\
&= \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_i Q^T_i \otimes [(d+1)\mathcal{E}(Q_i) - I], \tag{45}
\end{align*}
where we used that every LMC is unital and that \( \frac{1}{d} \sum_i Q^T_i = I \). Comparing equations (44) and (45), we may see that
\[ Q_i = (d+1)\mathcal{E}(Q_i) - I \tag{46} \]
by multiplying both sides by \( Q_j^T \otimes I \) and tracing over the first subsystem. The quasi-SICs form a basis for operator space, so it follows by linearity that
\[ \mathcal{E}(\rho) = \frac{I + \rho}{d+1}, \tag{47} \]
and so by Theorem 1 we are done.

4 Conclusions

In prior works we have emphasized the importance of MICs as a special class of measurements. The considerations of this paper developed from the idea that MICs may naturally furnish important classes of quantum channels as well. We affirmed this intuition with the introduction of LMCs which enabled us to discover several new ways in which SICs occupy a position of optimality among all MICs, supposing they exist. The appearance of additional equivalences with SIC existence plays two important roles. First, it should aid those trying to prove the SIC existence conjecture in all finite dimensions, and second, to our minds, it suggests that LMCs are a more important family of quantum channels than has been realized. We hope this work will inspire more study of LMCs and other types of channels derived from MICs not investigated here.

One example of such an alternative is a procedure where, when the agent implementing the channel applies the MIC, they reprepare the measured system in such a way that they ascribe a fixed quantum state to it, the choice of new state being made based on the measurement outcome. The action of such a channel is
\[ \mathcal{E}(\rho) = \sum_i (\text{tr} \rho E_i) \sigma_i, \tag{48} \]
where the states \( \{\sigma_i\} \) are the new preparations applied in consequence to the measurement outcomes. Channels defined by a POVM and a set of repreparations are known as entanglement-breaking channels [20]. When the POVM is a MIC, we can speak of an entanglement-breaking MIC channel (EBMC). EBMCs coincide with LMCs for rank-1 MICs and repreparations proportional to the MIC, but not in general. While earlier work already gives some indication that SIC channels are significant among EBMCs [1], we suspect that there is much more to be discovered about EBMCs as a class.
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A doubly quasistochastic matrix is a matrix of real numbers whose rows and columns sum to 1. If we assume that \( \{E_j\} \) is an equal-weight MIC, \( E_i = \frac{1}{d} \rho_i \), we will now show that \( U \) is furthermore doubly quasistochastic.

The Gram matrix for the \( K_i \) operators (30) is

\[
\text{tr} K_i K_j = (1/d - \gamma) \delta_{ij} + \gamma 
\]

where

\[
\gamma = \frac{d - 1 - (d - 2)\beta + 2\sqrt{(1 - \beta)(1 - \beta + d\beta)}}{d(d + 1)}.
\]

Since \( e_i = 1/d = \text{tr} E_i = \text{tr} \sqrt{E_i} \sqrt{E_i} \), we have

\[
\frac{1}{d} = \sum_{jk} [U]_{ij} [U]_{ik} \text{tr} K_j K_k
\]

\[
= \sum_{jk} [U]_{ij} [U]_{ik} ((1/d - \gamma) \delta_{jk} + \gamma)
\]

\[
= (1/d - \gamma) \sum_{jk} [U]_{ij} [U]_{ik} \delta_{jk} + \gamma \left( \sum_j [U]_{ij} \right)^2
\]

\[
= (1/d - \gamma) + \gamma \left( \sum_j [U]_{ij} \right)^2,
\]

from which we obtain

\[
\sum_j [U]_{ij} = 1.
\]

Now note that

\[
\text{tr} K_i = \frac{\sqrt{1 - \beta + d\beta} + (d - 1)\sqrt{1 - \beta}}{d}.
\]

Tracing both sides of (31) reveals that \( \text{tr} \sqrt{E_i} = \text{tr} K_i \) is a constant. Corollary 3 from [14] then asserts that

\[
\sum_i \sqrt{E_i} = \sum_j \left( \sum_i [U]_{ij} \right) K_j = \sqrt{d(1/d - \gamma) + d^3 \gamma I}.
\]

Summing equation (30) gives

\[
\sum_i K_i = \left( \sqrt{1 - \beta + d\beta} + (d - 1)\sqrt{1 - \beta} \right) I.
\]
As the $K_j$ form a linearly independent set, combining the previous two equations requires

$$\sum_i [U]_{ij} = \frac{\sqrt{1 - d\gamma + d^3\gamma}}{\sqrt{1 - \beta} + d\beta + (d - 1)\sqrt{1 - \beta}} = 1. \quad (56)$$

Thus $U$ is doubly quasistochastic, as claimed.